

teaching of anything contra
thereto. He is not at liberty public

teaching of anything contrary thereto. He is not at liberty publicly to exclaim against her distinctive tenets and laws as sinful sectarianism, or deny her right of distinctive ecclesiastical tenure. He is not at liberty to advocate the dropping off of her Presbyterian peculiarities for the sake of organic union. They are not "mere peculiarities"; they are vital to her system and to the truth of God. No, you do not bind any man "not to change" his views, but a change of views does bind every honorable man to ask release from the vows he took to adhere

abandoned, and not to advocate the new ones he embraces. Apply Mr. McCune's views of liberty to the oaths of Federal and State officers to support the National Constitution and to our theological professors maintain the standards of the Church and then imagine the result. T

doctrine is treason in both cases. was for the purpose of binding adherence, and non-departure from some doctrine, our standards were adopted by the fathers of the Presbyterian Church in this land. It was in the ov-

ture of John Thompson, a sire for aught I know of the respected elder you have put on this Committee of Prosecution, and at a time when the Infant Church had no constitution, in 1728, preliminary to the adopting act, that he besought the General Synod 'to publicly and authoritatively adopt the Westminster Confession and catechisms,' and the

'to oblige every Presbytery within ten days to oblige every candidate for the ministry to acknowledge the same Confession of Faith;' and next, 'I promise not to teach or preach anything contrary to it.' (Barre

Digest, page 29) Did the mean non-adherence? Is contemptuous exposition an authority? Is uniform practice of the Church an authority? Non-adherence! What means the act of 1758, "strictly enjoining it on all our members and probationers?"

he ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words, said confession and catechism, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereunto, and if their consciences will, permit them to allow any matter

etermined by the major vote of the Presbyterian Church, to 'peaceably withdraw.' (Digest, p. 48). What men the solemn pledge which in 1819 the Church imposed upon her theological professors to whom she was about to

trust the raising of her ministry? **D** it consistent with non-adherence? **D** it allow professors to drop off the distinctive features of Presbyterian doctrine and polity in their instruction, encourage her ministry in a disorganizing course she would not tolerate?

self for a moment? Why bind her instructions so strictly unless that she might also have a ministry trained without equivocation to the faithful maintenance of her standards?

"One other remark, gentlemen, to the

point. It is the habit of the advocates of so-called liberty to plead that in the vows of orationation they only subscribe to a system of doctrine as contained in the Confession. Mr. McCune has used it abundantly. It is a grievous mistake for Mr. McCune in the first place

that even this shelter for his new doctrines will not avail him, for he holds that denominations, as such, are 'essentially sinful,' and have scriptural right either to a distinct 'system' of doctrine, or to a distinct

existence. Upon his own showing, there is no right even to take a vow to maintain a distinctive 'system' of doctrine, let alone objecting to the doctrines in the system! He is utterly opposed to human deductions, 'system' or no system. We indeed that he will mis-

tem. To plead that he will maintain the distinctive system he declares has no right to exist, because the denomination it represents has none, is simply to convict himself of self-contradiction. If he maintains that 'system' has a right to exist, then

denomination built on that system has
right to exist also. If he maintains
denomination as such has no right
exist, then the system goes along
it. Either way the inter-pleader is valid.

Dr. Skinner was still speaking for

prosecution when our report closed.

GRAND LARCENY.

\$500 Worth of Law Books Ruined.
For some time past Aaron B. Quam

on, Esq., who occupies, with his partner, Mr. Williams, rooms in the building at Nos. 75 and 77 West Third, owned by Mr. Briggs Swift, has been missing valuable law books from his library.

he was at a loss to understand it, the robbery at last becoming unbearable, he instituted proceedings looking to the solving of the mystery. Placing the matter in the hands of Officer Meweger, of the American District Telegraph Company, that gentleman was

ceeded, after careful investigation, tracing the robbery to a colored man whom Mr. Swift had employed to act as janitor of the building, and who had daily and free access to the law office in the building, Mr. Champion's in-

The janitor's name is Benjamin Lye colored, who resides at No. 214 Canal avenue. He was arrested this morning in the building, with the sack in his possession, in which he had secreted the books in carrying them away. The thief confessed that he had taken the

and with a little persuasion was induced to go with the officer to John McCall's rag-house, on Walnut street, where after ripping off the leather backs of the volumes, valued at \$500, he had sold the paper for \$1.40. While he was in a p

lient mood, he also told them where sold a coat which he had stolen from Mr. Williams at the same time. The coat was recovered at the house of Mrs. Siroman, No. 47 East Third street, where he had sold it for 50 cents. The father is now at the Hammond street

The other day a man stepped into a railroad car on one of the Burlington roads and asked for a carfare to

Twelve gentlemen reached down to their pocket cork persuaders. When they were feeling for them he explained that he wanted to get the cork out of a bottle of rheumatism liniment, as his wrists were painful, and immediately

twelve gentlemen were surprised and
grieved to discover that they had
their corkscrews at home.

Alexander II does not seem to have
done his great work of emancipation
thoroughly as he might. In the

thoroughly as he might. In the last seven governments of Russia, when the law for the abolition of serfdom has been in force since 1831, there are a two million seven thousand eight hundred and fifty-four serfs
